

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/042,493	MCARDLE, JAMES M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chih-Ching Chow	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chih-Ching Chow.

(3) Paul Hletko.

(2) John Chavis.

(4) Frank Nicholas (Reg. No. 33,983).

Date of Interview: 02 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 5,220,675.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 2192

Telephone Interview Summary

Telephone Interview Date and Time: 12/02/2004 2:00pm

Participants: Chih-Ching Chow, John Chavis (Primary Examiner), Paul Hletko (Attorney), Frank Nicholas (Attorney, Reg. No. 33983)

Case Number: 10/042,493

Filing Date: 01/09/2002

Inventor: James M. McArdle

Assignee: IBM

Summary:

- For 112(2) rejection for claim 1:

Attorney explained that the 'capture a system command environment' means 'capture all parameters for a system command', for item (c), the 'adding at least one parameter string', actually means 'changing the command by adding a parameter string'. For example, for a ping command, if the original ping command is to ping 108.06.0, the system command would store the entire command to the array and still using the command 'PING', so when entering the PINT command with another parameter to it, ping 108.05.0, the system would actually ping both system addresses 108.06.0 and 108.05.0.

Examiners' comments:

Chih: The 112(2) sustains, since the spec does not teach the current invention is 'changing' the command.

John: "I would give a 112(1) rejection at the first place", the spec does not support the claims, the inventor 'borrowed' the IBM WebSphere concept as his own invention, the inventor put 'general' information in paragraphs 17-20 and failed to put specific teachings to this invention.

- For 103 rejection:

Attorney argued that Padawer's disclosure does not 'capture' the original command plus additional parameter.

Chih:

See Padawer's column 2, lines 6-15. Padawer's disclosure CAN include implementing external command with additional parameters.

John:

"I don't see anything wrong with the 103 rejection", since it's not clear in the spec therefore the argument can't overcome the 112(2) and 103 rejections.

Art Unit: 21~~9~~2

Conclusions:

No agreement was reached.

Attorney will submit a formal written spec to include the details of the teaching for the application. Attorney will also add the related case number 10/042,494 to the spec.